

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,658	01/29/2004	Masaki Okamoto	36409	5389
116 PEARNE & G	7590 02/27/2007		EXAMINER	
1801 EAST 9TH STREET			PATEL, SHAMBHAVI K	
SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2128	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/767,658	OKAMOTO ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Shambhavi Patel	2128				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 08 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad		e final rejection, whichever is later. In	no.			
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the			110			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date or been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. tatutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension fee under 3 final Office action; or (2) as set forth i	37 in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS	Do mod wami are amo period oct is					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloc) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beauppeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); etter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying the issues	; for			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-32	4).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be the non-allowable claim(s).	allowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendment cancel	ing			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an explanation	n of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .		·				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	=					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to provide				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanati REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after o	entry is below or attached.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered been continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowance becau	se:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
13. Other:						
		·				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant submits that Sarvar et al. does not teach "executing a simulation based on a first condition selected for a first step; selecting a simulated result from the first simulation executing step as a simulation condition for a second step; and executing a simulation of the second step based on a second condition, wherein the second condition contains at least the simulation condition" because Sarvar only simulates a peak temperature based on empirically obtained varying specific heat capacities. The Examiner notes that the "empirically obtained varying specific heat capacities" in Sarvar are first simulated, and based on this the temperatures can be simulated. See for example, the 3rd paragraph in "Modeling Variable Materials Data" which discloses modeling the variable behavior of C(p) (so that it may be simulated), and then simulating the change in temperature ("Modeling of an Exemplary Product and Process Combination"). The Applicant is further directed to "3) Density, Emissivity, and Conductivity Values" which discloses modeling the sensitivity of simulated peak temperatures to variations in emissivity. Applicant submits that Sarvar does not disclose a condition table. Applicant is directed to Table III, which models the effect of variation in heat capacity (first simulated condition) on change in temperature (second simulated condition). The 101 rejection is maintained, because while a simulation result is obtained, this is not necessarily a real world result, and may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER